DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 197 923 RC 012 518

TITLE	Iowa Annual Evaluation Report for Migrant Programs. Fiscal Year 1980.
INSTITUTION	Iowa State Dept. of Public Instruction, Des Moines.
SPONS AGENCY	Bureau of Elementary and Secondary Education (DHEW/OE), Washington, D.C. Div. of Compensatory Education.
PUB DATE	80
NOTE	15p.: For related documents, see ED 180 697 and ED 183 330.
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Agency Cooperation: Elementary Secondary Education: *Inservice Education: Mexican Americans: *Migrant Education: Migrant Health Services: *Needs Assessment: *Parent Participation: *Program Effectiveness: Program Evaluation: Spanish Speaking: *State Programs: Student Recruitment
IDENTIFIERS	ESEA Title I Migrant Programs: *Iowa

ABSTRACT

Six migrant educational programs were conducted in Iowa during fiscal year 1980. In the 4 programs held during the regular school year, 7 teachers and 3 aides (all bilingual) served an enrollment of 211 children, 187 of whom were Spanish dominate. During the 2 summer programs, 8 bilingual teachers and 6 bilingual aides served 154 children, 110 of whom were Spanish dominate. Curriculum included English oral language development, reading, mathematics, and cultural development. Health, music, art, and field trips were added during summer. Staff received inservice training in all programs. Supportive services included visional, audio, dental, and immunization screenings with treatment administered when indicated. Nutritional services were also provided. The Local Education Associations (LEAs) employed a variety of methods to recruit migrant children and to establish the educational needs of the children. An unduplicated count of 87 parents participated in some manner with the schools in migrant programs held during the school year; 78 parents participated during the summer. The LEAs reported: (1) good utilization of the Migrant Student Record System, especially the Skills List concept; (2) use of numerous methods to disseminate information; (3) maintenance of contact between LEAs and the State Education Agency; and (4) successful attainment, by age level, of educational components by the migrant children. (CM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

FEB 1981
ERIC/CRESS
RECEIVED

ED197923

IOWA ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT FOR MIGRANT PROGRAMS

Fiscal Year 1980

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

RC 01 25518

Department of Public Instruction

5200-D70322-1/81

State of Iowa
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION
Grimes State Office Building
Des Moines, Iowa 50319

STATE BOARD OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION

Susan M. Wilson, President, Waterloo
Karen K. Goodenow, Vice-President, Wall Lake
William N. Cropp, Des Moines
Jolly Ann Davidson, Clarinda
Jon H. Kneen, Ottumwa
Dianne L.D. Paca, Garner
Mary E. Robinson, Cedar Rapids
John E. van der Linden, Sibley
Harold R. Yeoman, Monticello

ADMINISTRATION

Robert D. Benton, State Superintendent and Executive Officer
of the State Board of Public Instruction
David H. Bechtel, Administrative Assistant
James E. Mitchell, Deputy State Superintendent

Pupil Personnel Services Branch

Drexel D. Lange, Associate Superintendent
Oliver T. Himley, Chief, Title I, ESEA
James F. Bottenfield, Migrant Consultant, Title I, ESEA

I O W A

A N N U A L E V A L U A T I O N R E P O R T

F O R M I G R A N T P R O G R A M S

F I S C A L Y E A R 1 9 8 0

Title I of Public Law 89-10

The Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965
As Amended

State of Iowa
Department of Public Instruction
Des Moines, Iowa

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Regular Term	Page
Unduplicated Number of Children and Staff	1
Inservice for Staff	1
Medical	2
Recruiting and Establishing Educational Needs	2
Parent Involvement	3
Cooperation With Other Programs and Agencies	3
Dissemination	4
SEA Contact with LEAs	4
Instructional Activities	4
Summer Term	
Unduplicated Number of Children and Staff	6
Inservice for Staff	7
Medical	7
Recruiting and Establishing Educational Needs	7
Parent Involvement	8
Cooperation With Other Programs and Agencies	8
Dissemination	8
SEA Contact with LEAs	9
Instructional Activities	9

TABLES

Statewide Migrant Instructional Activities (Regular Term)	5
Statewide Migrant Instructional Activities (Summer Term)	10

IOWA ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT

FOR TITLE I MIGRANT PROGRAMS

Fiscal Year 1980

There were six migrant educational programs in Iowa for Fiscal Year 1980. There were four programs conducted during the regular school year, and two programs conducted during the summer months.

For the regular school year, there were two hundred eleven (211) children enrolled. The breakdown in classification was ninety-nine interstate, eleven intrastate, and one hundred one five-year provisional children. Gradewise there were five prekindergarten, eighteen kindergarten, one hundred sixty-five elementary, and twenty-three secondary children enrolled.

Inasmuch as the children were enrolled in the regular school curriculum during the regular school year, the Title I Migrant program was supplementary in nature. There were seven teachers and three teacher aides all of whom were bilingual providing additional services for the children. The curricular areas provided by the migrant program were in English oral language development, reading, mathematics, and cultural development. Of the two hundred eleven children enrolled, one hundred eighty-seven were Spanish dominate. The average daily attendance was one hundred eighty-two days with the highest daily attendance of two hundred one for the school year.

Inservice of staff as reported by the LEAs for the regular school year included teachers, aides, nurses, clerks, and administrators.

The inservice areas were in general program orientation, curriculum methods, individualized instruction, use of MSRTS, instructional objectives, student placement and diagnosis, and culture of the migrant child. The LEAs reported that thirty-nine staff members were involved in the inservice meetings which indicates that the migrant educational program was reaching out and involving the regular staff members to create a better understanding of the migrant child.

Supportive services to the migrant children as reported by the LEAs included one hundred fifty-nine visional screenings which led to two children receiving glasses; one hundred ten audio screenings which required no audio aid services for the children; thirty-three dental screenings which led to twenty children receiving dental treatment; all of the children's immunization records were screened, and nine children received immunization treatment.

Nutritional services were provided the migrant children on the same basis as other children enrolled in school; and if the migrant child's parents could not afford the hot lunch, the children were given free lunches.

The process of recruiting migrant children included a variety of methods by the LEAs. The methods reported in recruiting were visits by school representatives with the local growers or food processors, visits to the migrant camps, visits with other local community agencies, and, in some instances, the parents voluntarily sending or bringing their children to school.

In establishing the educational needs of the children, the LEAs utilized the Migrant Student Record Transfer System, criterion referenced tests, standardized tests, teacher-made tests, and other teacher referrals as they met with other staff members.

Parental involvement was also diversified which led to an unduplicated count of eighty-seven parents participating in some manner with the schools. These methods utilized by the LEAs included twenty-five parents attending orientation meetings concerning the migrant educational program; eleven parents were involved in planning project activities; fifty-four parents visited in their child's classroom; eight parents were active in recruitment; two parents helped supervise field trips; five parents acted as aides; fifty-two parents were contacted by school staff in their homes; seventy-seven attended school functions such as open house and other related functions; eighteen parents participated in their local Parent Advisory Council; and six parents served on the State Parent Advisory Council.

The LEAs reported utilization of the Migrant Student Record System. They were especially enthused with the Skills List concept. A State training session was held to indoctrinate the teachers with the skills list and how to use them. In addition, follow-up training sessions were held in each LEA migrant center to reinforce the proper use of the skills list. During the follow-up sessions, the whole concept of the MSRTS was explained with each staff member gaining an understanding of their role in making the MSRTS operate as it should for the benefit of the migrant children.

Cooperation between the LEAs and other agencies serving the migrant population was maintained according to reports from the LEAs. The other agencies were the Local Migrant Council, Community Action, local Title I projects, County Health Department, CETA, School Lunch Program, Department of Social Services, Project Head Start, and Local Day Care Center.

The LEAs reported numerous ways utilized in disseminating information concerning their migrant educational programs. Among the methods reported were local newspaper articles, use of brochures or newsletters, oral and written communication with parents of the migrant children, reports to their local school boards, discussion with other migrant staff at SEA sponsored workshops, and visitation with other migrant programs.

Contact between the LEAs and the SEA was maintained by SEA inservice meeting, telephone contact, letters, and program visitation by the SEA. During these contacts, the SEA assisted the LEAs in developing their project application, responding to financial questions or problems, completion of required report forms, clarification of guidelines, and developing their evaluation report.

In reporting on the instructional activities supported by migrant funds, the LEAs felt that by their standards of success by age level, the migrant children's assimilation of the educational components was attained. The following is a composite report from the LEAs.

INSTRUCTIONAL ACTIVITIES

A. The number of participants by age level
B. The number meeting your standard(s) of success by age level
C. Total number of participants per activity

INSTRUCTIONAL ACTIVITY		AGE LEVEL 3-5*	6-8	9-10	11-12	13-14	15-16	17-18	C TOTAL # PARTICIPANTS
Mathe-	A		10	8	11	16			45
matics	B		10	8	11	16			//////////
Eng. Lang.	A	11	22	39	32	29	7	1	141
Arts/Rdg.	B	9	20	32	29	26	5	1	//////////
English	A	13	28	41	35	29	12	5	163
Oral Lang.	B	11	28	37	30	23	11	3	//////////
Cultural Dev/Self-	A	5	10	14	16	16	5	3	69
Image	B	5	10	13	16	15	5	2	//////////

*Include readiness skills in applicable instructional activity categories

For the Fiscal Year 1980 summer there were two programs for the migrant children. One of the programs encompassed an area comprised of four LEAs. This combining into one summer program gave us a sufficient number of children to efficiently add more educational components to the migrant program.

The two summer programs served a total of one hundred fifty-four children. The breakdown in classification was sixty-three interstate, nine intrastate, and eighty-two five-year provisional children. Gradewise there were eighteen kindergarten and one hundred thirty-six elementary children enrolled. An attempt was made to contact the secondary grade children to establish core curriculum classes, but there was no interest in this area. However, in the other program enough interest was indicated to establish a driver education course for the secondary age migrant children.

There were eight teachers and six teacher aides, all of whom were bilingual. In addition, two administrators, one recruiter, two clerks, three hot lunch cooks, and four bus drivers employed in the summer programs. The curricular areas provided by the migrant programs were in English oral language development, reading, mathematics, cultural development, health, music, and art. Of the one hundred fifty-four children enrolled, one hundred ten were Spanish dominate. The average daily attendance was ninety-eight with the highest daily attendance of one hundred fifteen for the summer program.

The project duration for one of the summer projects was thirty-one class days and the other project was twenty-nine class days.

Inservice of staff as reported by the LEAs for the summer term included teachers, aides, recruiters, nurses, clerks, and administrators. The inservice areas were in general program orientation, curriculum needs, individualized instruction, grouping techniques, use of MSRTS, utilization of teacher aides, instructional objectives, student placement and diagnosis, and culture of the migrant child. The LEAs reported that nineteen staff members were involved in the inservice meetings.

Supportive services to the migrant children as reported by the LEAs included forty-one visional screenings, eleven audio screenings, twelve dental screenings, and thirty-nine medical screenings. The only treatment needed was twelve children received dental treatment.

Nutritional services were provided free of charge to the summer migrant children. This included breakfast, mid-morning milk and snacks, hot lunch, and a mid-afternoon milk/juice and snacks.

Field trips to various places of interest to the children were arranged. The teachers made a point of including various aspects of the field trips into the daily lesson plans for the children. Regularly scheduled swimming lessons were also incorporated into the summer program.

The process of recruiting migrant children followed the same methods utilized during the regular school year. They included visits by school representatives to the migrant camps, visits with local growers or food processors, and information supplied by local community agencies.

In establishing the educational needs of the children, the LEAs utilized the Migrant Student Record System, criterion referenced tests, standardized tests, and teacher-made tests.

Parental involvement with the summer school program was established by a diversification of methods which led to an unduplicated count of seventy-eight parents participating in some manner with the schools. The methods utilized by the LEAs included fourteen parents attending orientation meetings concerning the summer migrant educational program; ten parents were involved in planning project activities; forty-two parents visited in their child's classroom; eight parents were active in recruitment; seventy-eight parents were contacted by school staff in their homes; forty parents attended school functions such as fiesta day; six parents participated in the local Parent Advisory Council; and four parents served on the State Parent Advisory Council.

The LEAs reported utilization of the Migrant Student Record System. They were very pleased with the Skills List concept when they received information on some of the children enrolled in the summer program. They took this as a sign that the MSRTS really works. A follow-up briefing at each summer attendance center refreshed their memory as to proper usage of the MSRTS.

Cooperation between the LEAs and other agencies serving the migrant population was maintained according to reports from the LEAs. The other agencies were the Local Migrant Council, Community Action Agencies, County Health Department, CETA, School Lunch Program, Department of Social Services, and Project Head Start.

The LEAs reported their dissemination of information concerning the summer migrant program via brochures or newsletters, oral and written communication with parents of the migrant children, reports to their local school boards, and discussion with other migrant staff at SEA sponsored meetings.

Contact between the LEAs and the SEA was maintained by SEA inservice meeting, telephone contact, letters, and program visitation by the SEA. During these contacts the SEA assisted the LEAs in developing their project applications, responding to financial questions or problems, completion of required report forms, clarification of guidelines, and developing their evaluation report.

In reporting on the instructional activities supported by migrant funds, the LEAs felt, that by their standards of success by age level, the migrant children's assimilation of the education components was attained. The following is a composite report from the LEAs.

INSTRUCTIONAL ACTIVITIES

A. The number of participants by age level
B. The number meeting your standard(s) of success by age level
C. Total number of participants per activity

INSTRUCTIONAL ACTIVITY		AGE LEVEL 3-5*	6-8	9-10	11-12	13-14	15-16	17-18	C TOTAL # PARTICIPANTS
Mathe-	A	16	46	27	15	3			107
matics	B	12	34	23	13	3			////////////////
Eng. Lang.	A	16	49	30	19	4			118
Arts/Rdg.	B	8	39	27	19	4			////////////////
English	A	16	47	27	15	3			108
Oral Lang.	B	12	46	25	14	3			////////////////
Cultural Dev/Self-	A		47	27	15	3			92
Image	B		45	26	15	3			////////////////
Physical	A	16	61	42	31	4			154
Education	B	16	61	42	31	4			////////////////
Health/	A		45	26	15	3			89
Nutrition	B		45	23	15	3			////////////////
Music/	A	16	61	42	31	4			154
Dance	B	14	61	40	31	4			////////////////

*Include readiness skills in applicable instructional activity categories